

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
EASTERN DISTRICT OF WISCONSIN

---

WILLIE J HICKLES,

Plaintiff,

v.

Case No. 06-C-226

DR. ENRIQUE LUY, HOLLY PUHL,  
CAPTAIN GOGGIN, SGT. LYYSKI,

Defendants.

---

**ORDER**

---

Pro se plaintiff Willie J. Hickles filed a motion for an order compelling disclosure or discovery pursuant to Rule 37 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure. In his motion, Hickles sets forth his demands for the following information:

1. A copy of Dr. Luys' Wisconsin state license to practice medicine and surgery and a copy of his criminal record, moving violations and any and all medical malpractice lawsuits.
2. A copy of Captain Goggin's prison conduct reports and the number of reprimands for his misconduct. His license, certification to be a corrections officer and any records of his promotions during in his career.
3. A copy of Sergeant Lyyski's reprimands from her conduct in office, her license and certification to be a prison officer and a record of any promotions.
4. A copy of HSM Holly Puhl's certificate to be an HSU manager and her qualifications, as well as all reprimands. All directives and policy of procedure for captains concerning inmates.

The motion will be denied for failure to comply with the local rules of the district. The local rules require that all motions for discovery pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 26-37 be accompanied by a

written statement by a movant that “after personal consultation with the party adverse to the motion and after sincere attempts to resolve their differences, the parties are unable to reach an accord.” Civil L.R. 37.1. The statement must also recite the date and time of such conference and the name of all parties participating in it. Plaintiff’s motion is not accompanied by any indication that any conversation or effort was made to consult with counsel for the defendants before filing his motion for discovery. Moreover, even if he had complied with the local rules, it does not appear that the specific requests would be granted in any event. Personal records and files concerning the defendant’s are not automatically discoverable, and plaintiff has offered no justification for granting such relief in this case. Accordingly, the motion for discovery is denied.

**SO ORDERED** this 23rd day of September, 2006.

s/ William C. Griesbach  
\_\_\_\_\_  
William C. Griesbach  
United States District Judge